

E666
E 17f

...Fables of Phaedrus...

Robinson Ellis

A
A
0
0
0
3
9
9
0
1
5
7



THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY FACILITY



THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

THE
FABLES OF PHAEDRUS

An Inaugural Lecture

BY

ROBINSON ELLIS, M.A.

CORPUS PROFESSOR OF LATIN LITERATURE

London

HENRY FROWDE

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE
AMEN CORNER, E.C.

OXFORD: 116 HIGH STREET

Price One Shilling net

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

THE
FABLES OF PHAEDRUS

An Inaugural Lecture

BY

ROBINSON ELLIS, M.A.

CORPUS PROFESSOR OF LATIN LITERATURE

London

HENRY FROWDE

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE
AMEN CORNER, E.C.

OXFORD: 116 HIGH STREET

Oxford

HORACE HART, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

PA
6566
E475

ON PHAEDRUS' FABLES

PHAEDRUS, for such seems to have been his name rather than Phaeder, a somewhat rare by-form found in Inscriptions and the palimpsest of Fronto, was born, as he himself tells us, in the mountainous district of the Thracian or Macedonian Pieria. In the prologue to the third book of the Fables which is headed in the earliest MS. *Phaedrus ad Eutychem*, he speaks of himself thus :

Ego quem Pierio mater enixa est iugo
In quo tonanti sancta Mnemosyne Ioui
Fecunda nouis artium peperit chorum :

and he goes on to explain that his words are meant literally¹ and cannot be interpreted merely of his being brought up from boyhood in scholastic and literary pursuits in vv. 52-59 of the same *Prologus* :

Si Phryx Aesopus potuit, si Anacharsis Scythæ
Aeternam famam condere ingenio suo :
Ego, litteratae qui sum propior Graeciae,
Cur somno inerti deseram patriae decus ?
Threissa cum gens numeret auctores suos,
Linoque Apollo sit parens, Musa Orpheo,
Qui saxa cantu mouit et domuit feras
Hebrique tenuit impetus dulci mora.

At what time he removed to Italy is not known ; but it must have been there that he read, still a boy, as he himself tells us, the verse of Ennius *Palam muttire plebeio piaculum est* (iii. Epilog. 34). In the two tenth-century MSS. which have preserved his Fables, Phaëdrus is called

¹ As Ludwig Schwabe proves against Wölfflin (*Rh. Mus.* xxxix. p. 476).

Augusti libertus. As there is no reason to question the authenticity of this statement, it would seem that he became a slave in the household of Octavianus and was subsequently manumitted, possibly, as Lucian Müller suggests, for his dextrous manners or literary accomplishments.

It was probably in the reign of Tiberius that he published his first two books of fables. I should suppose that Book i. was published by itself; then Book ii., as in the former Phaedrus restricts himself to purely Aesopian fables or stories of Greek origin¹ (i. 14; i. 18), in the latter introduces stories from his own time, e.g. the story of Tiberius and the Busybody² (ii. 5). He apologizes for doing so in the Prologue to Book ii. 'For my self,' he says, 'I shall observe with all possible care the practice of Aesop: still if the humour seizes me to introduce something of my own, just to give variety, I could wish my reader to take it in good part' (*bonas in partes, lector, accipias uelim*). It was after the publication of Book ii. that Phaedrus was attacked by Sejanus. Various fables have been singled out as the cause of this prosecution. The passage in which Phaedrus mentions it (iii. Prolog. 38-44)—

Ego porro illius semitam feci uiam,
Et cogitaui plura quam reliquerat,
In calamitatem deligens quaedam meam.
Quodsi accusator alius Sciano foret,
Si testis alius, iudex alius denique,
Dignum faterer esse me tantis malis,
Nec his dolorem delenirem remediis—

¹ Ribbeck, *Geschichte der Römischen Dichtung*, iii. p. 26. Otto Crusius (*Rh. Mus.* xxxix. p. 603) shows that several of these stories (e.g. *Aesopus et Rusticus* Phaed. iii. 3 = Pseudo-Plutarch *Conuiuium vii Sapientum* 3, Ph. iii. 8 *Frater et Soror* = Plut. *Coniug. Praecept.* 25, Ph. i. 18 *Mulier parturiens* = Plut. *Coniug. Praecept.* 39) are also found in Plutarch or in writings attributed to him. Crusius concludes that both writers drew from a common source, possibly the collection of Demetrius Phalereus. See also Rutherford, *Babrius*, *Introd.* p. xi.

² Even if we had not the express statement of Phaedrus that the second book differed from the first, the self-completeness of Book i. would be sufficient reason for publishing it by itself.

cannot be said to determine much. Yet the words which immediately follow—

Suspitione si quis errabit sua
 Et rapiet ad se quod erit commune omnium,
 Stulte nudabit animi conscientiam.
 Huic excusatum me uelim nihilo minus.
 Neque enim notare singulos mens est mihi,
 Verum ipsam uitam et mores hominum ostendere—

seem to me not obscurely to indicate that some of the fables were thought to reflect on individuals. Such a personal allusion has been traced by the Père Desbillons in the fable of the Frogs protesting against the marriage of the Sun (i. 6). There the Frogs finding their pool dried up by the sun's heat, and alarmed by the rumour that the Sun is thinking of marriage, set up a loud croaking. Jupiter inquires the reason, and is told: 'if one Sun can dry up our pool and kill us for want of water, what will he do if he breeds a family?' What is this but a transparent satire on the intended marriage and actual adultery of Sejanus with Livilla, the sister of Germanicus and wife of Tiberius' son Drusus? The Sun is of course Sejanus: Jupiter, the Emperor Tiberius: the frogs are the Roman nobles, the object of Sejanus' unremitting attacks. Or again, it might seem that the story of Tiberius' *atriensis* (ii. 5) was too distinct a reflexion on the Sacred Household. Whatever the reason, the freedman of Augustus was accused by the favourite of Tiberius, no doubt of *maiestas*, and, as we may perhaps infer from the words *Nec his dolorem delenire remediis*, condemned, though we have no intimation as to the form of his punishment.

To alleviate his distress, Phaedrus wrote his third book of Fables, and addressed it to Eutychus, who has been identified with a freedman of Caligula¹, or of Claudius,

¹ Bücheler, *Rh. Mus.* xxxvii. pp. 333 sqq. identifies this Eutychus to whom Book iii. is addressed with the charioteer of Caligula. He was high in favour, and on one occasion received from Caligula at a banquet a gift of 2,000,000 sesterces. He seems to have been employed in building Caligula's stables (Joseph. *Antiq.* xix. 4, 4). Perhaps identical with the Eutychus who accused

but of whom we do not know certainly that he was a freedman at all. In this book Phaedrus generally keeps to Aesopian fables: in one case only he has introduced a story of his own time, in order, as he tells us, that the fables of antiquity may escape disparagement. The Epilogue to this book has been displaced in the MSS., and transferred to the end of Book iv. At least such was the opinion of Brotier and it is accepted by L. Müller. That Brotier was right is probable (1) from the Epilogue agreeing with the Prologue in describing Phaedrus' friend as immersed in business and with difficulty snatching an hour to read the fables, (2) from the allusion, common to both, of the danger in which the poet was placed, and from which he begs his friend to rescue him without delay.

The fourth book is dedicated to Particulo, who is described as delighting in fables, and so much an admirer of Phaedrus' literary gift as to transcribe his fables with his own hand. In this book there is an increasing tendency to introduce stories or myths instead of fables; in three instances these are Greek; no. 5 is the story of the Athenian whose will was disputed, 22 of the shipwrecked Simonides, 26 of Simonides' escape from a house falling in ruins, through the intervention of the Dioscuri; one is an apologue of Phaedrus' own invention, and is explained by himself: it is no. 11, the Thief and the Lamp, an imaginary legend or *αἴτιον* to account for the fact which we should hardly have known otherwise, that it was unlawful to light a lamp from a sacrificial flame, or to use a lamp for lighting an altar-fire.

Book v. contains only ten fables. Of these the first is a story of Demetrius Phalereus and the poet Menander, and is obviously drawn from Greek sources; the seventh, Princeps tibicen, the flute-player Princeps¹, is a story

Agrippa to Tiberius (*Antiq.* xviii. 6, 5). Bücheler thinks that Phaedrus sent Book iii. to Eutychus about 40 A. D.

¹ An inscription is extant in which Princeps seems to be mentioned:—*L. Mini tibicinis | Cassia uxor | L. Cassi Principis | capuae*. See Bücheler in *Rh. Mus.* xxxvii. p. 332.

of Augustan Rome; the fifth, *Scurra et Rusticus* or the Mimic and the Country Clown, might be a Greek, but is perhaps more likely to be a Roman story; the eighth, *Tempus*, is an allegorical description of Time as

Caluus, comosa fronte, nudo occipitio,
Quem si occuparis, teneas : elapsum semel
Non ipse possit Iuppiter reprehendere.

This book seems to have been dedicated to one Philetus, as the last verse in it shows—

Hoc cur, Philete, scripserim, pulchre vides.

(where P gives *fili te*, R *fili de*). Ribbeck¹ thinks that Phaedrus alludes in this fable to his own old age (v. 10).

It is not known at what time Phaedrus died. But the fact that he speaks of his fables as likely to immortalize Particulo, to whom Book iv. is dedicated, is enough to prove that they had won him fame before his death. It is however remarkable that he is ignored by Seneca, who speaks of Aesopian tales as a work unattempted by Roman genius (*Aesopios logos intemptatum Romanis ingeniis opus*²). Quintilian is equally silent: nor is any verse from the Fables quoted by Aulus Gellius, Macrobius, or the Grammarians. Even Priscian in a passage³, cited by Pithou, the first editor of Phaedrus, in a passage expressly treating of Aesop and the literature of fables, mentions Hesiod, Archilochus, Plautus, Horace, as using them, but has not a word for Phaedrus. In this respect he only shared the fate of several other writers, e.g. Q. Curtius and Manilius. The one inscription⁴ in which a line is quoted from him, iii. 17, 12 :

Nisi utile est quod facimus, stulta est gloria

¹ *Geschichte der Röm. Dichtung*, iii. p. 27.

² *Consol. ad Polyb.* xxvii.

³ *Prisc. Praeexercitament.* I; vol. ii. ed. Hertz, p. 430.

⁴ Hervieux, i. p. 142. The inscription, on a stone discovered at Wissemburg in Transylvania by Stephen Zamoyski, was published by him at Padua in 1593 in his *Analecta lapidum uetustorum et aliarum in Dacia antiquitatum*, and subsequently in Gruter's *Collection*, p. 898, no. 16. *C. I. L.* iii. 58*.

is not considered genuine by Mommsen. Martial seems to mean our fabulist, *Epigr.* iii. 20, 5:—

An aemulatur improbi¹ iocos Phaedri?

Prudentius has borrowed the greater part of one of his lines Cathemer. vii. 115:—

Alui capacis uiuus hauritur specu².

Lastly Avianus, in the Preface to his own elegiac fables, combines Phaedrus with Babrius, and tells us that while Babrius confined his work to two books, Phaedrus expanded his into five.

The expression of Avianus *Phaedrus partem aliquam (fabularum) quinque in libellos resoluit* is noticeable. Expansion is not the idea which our existing five books convey. On the contrary the shortness of the second and fifth books is remarkable, and even if they equalled in length the other three, they would not be long. The total number of fables in Lucian Müller's edition amounts to xxxi + viii + xix + xxvi + x = 94, a sum which as compared with the number of Greek fables in Halm's collection does not reach to one-fourth of the whole. We are therefore prepared in advance to expect that the Fables have not come down to us in their original state. Examination proves that it is so. In the Prologue to Book i. Phaedrus deprecates indignation

Quod arbores loquantur, non tantum ferae,

whereas no tree is introduced in the fables which now form that book.

Again at the beginning of Book iv. Phaedrus tells us he had determined to conclude his fables with the third book, in order that he might leave materials for other fabulists.

¹ I would explain *improbi*, which at first sight is surprising, of fables such as i. 29, iii. 1, iii. 3, iv. 16, iv. 19; there were, no doubt, others in the lost portions of the collection. Martial has several direct imitations of Phaedrus, e.g. xi. 69, 9 *Fulmineo spumantis apri sum dente perempta*, cf. Phaedr. i. 21, 5 *Aper fulmineis ad eum uenit dentibus*; Mart. vii. 44, 7 *Si victura meis mandantur nomina chartis*, cf. Phaedr. iv. Epil. *Particula chartis nomen uicturum meis* (Hervieux i. p. 166).

² Phaedr. iv. 6, 10 *Capacis alui mersit Tartareo specu*.

Could he have said so if the fifty-eight fables which now represent the first three books, were all they originally contained? It seems impossible in face of the large number of extant Greek fables, even if some of these were invented later. Moreover, the frequency with which the regular series of the fables in this book is interrupted by sudden interpositions of the writer's personality—indicated in the MSS. by the repeated *Poeta*, *Phaedrus*, *Phaedrus*, *Poeta*—seems to me to point to an originally larger total, sections of which were perhaps marked off from the rest, by the poet thus re-presenting himself personally¹. I say nothing here of the thirty-one Perottine fables, first published by Jannelli at the beginning of this century, because they are not certainly by Phaedrus, though much in his manner.

If the five books of Fables which we now have are not in the same condition in which they were read by Avianus, when did this abridgment or mutilation begin? We can only answer vaguely: it must fall between the fourth century, in which Avianus wrote, and the ninth or early tenth, in which the most ancient MS. of Phaedrus, the *Pithocanus*, was written. But as Avianus must have read the fables in the verse form in which they were written, i.e. with the intervals between each line marked, whereas in the *Pithocanus* they are written with no such distinction and look like prose, we must suppose a considerable period to have elapsed in which (1) the above-mentioned abridgment or mutilation took place, (2) the iambs of the poet were

¹ This question is of course quite distinct from that of lacunae in particular parts of the archetype as transmitted in *PR*, e.g. in Book iv. The three lines which precede the thirteenth fable *Vtilius homini nihil est quam recte loqui. Probanda cunctis est quidem sententia, Sed ad perniciem solet agi sinceritas* do not agree with the story of the Lion feigning righteousness and then returning to his old nature, which immediately follows them in *PR*, but to a lost fable perhaps, as L. Müller thinks, Romul. iv. 8. The lacunose condition of both MSS. at this part of Book iv. is best discernible by a glance at Berger de Xivrey's facsimile of the page (the seventieth) in the codex *Pithocanus*. The first line is *Postquam lauare cepit penitentia*, which is followed, without any break, by the two verses, obviously of a perfectly distinct fable, *A fictione u. l. m., Adfinitatem traxit i. o.*

no longer distinguished as verse, but written continuously as prose. Such a barbarous transformation can hardly have happened in the Carolingian period, which was an age of learned revival, and, speaking comparatively, of illumination. But it does not follow that it belongs to the Merovingian. It seems possible that the abridgment, if any abridgment was made, may have been executed in the fifth or sixth century, and that the gradually declining knowledge of ancient language and metre, which the unsettled state of Europe produced, caused the iambs of Phaedrus to be written in prose. As prose they were probably read by the Carolingian scholars: they did not introduce the transformation, but handed it on as it had come to them from an age of illiteracy.

It must be left to the researches of a Traube or a Manitius, to state positively whether the fables in their iambic form were known to any writer of the Middle Age. At one time I believed that Rather, Bishop of Verona in the latter part of the tenth century, quoted the first fable. His words are *Fluvius enim malignae operationis illorum ab eis ad me decurrit*, which might be taken direct from Phaedrus, i. 1, 8, *A te decurrit ad meos haustus liquor*. But the words *ad me decurrit*, are found also in Romulus and several others of the prose paraphrases¹ brought together by the laborious researches of Hervieux; and from one of these Rather may well have derived his knowledge of the Fable. Yet there is nothing outrageous in supposing that the learned prelate, who, as we know from his Sermon on Martha and Mary, had read Catullus and Plautus at Verona, and who frequently cites other classical poets, may also have had access to a MS. of the fables, similar to Pithou's or to the *Remensis*.

¹ Of these prose versions the oldest yet known is contained in a MS. of the eleventh century, written in the Abbey of S. Martial de Limoges, seemingly by the chronicler Ademar de Chabonais, a monk of the Abbey who died in Palestine after 1030. See Hervieux, *Fabulistes Latins*, ii. 121-145, Gaston Paris in his Review of Hervieux, *Journal des Savants*, 1884-5. Hervieux has also published a résumé of his researches in his *Notice Historique et Critique sur les fables Latines de Phèdre et de ses anciens imitateurs*, Paris, Didot, 1884.

So far however as research has yet been carried, it is through the prose paraphrases mainly, if not alone, that Phaedrus was known throughout the Middle Age. The investigations of Hervieux, who has made this part of the question the special object of a minute and prolonged study, have so widely extended our knowledge of this prose fable literature, as to require a separate treatment, which cannot be included in the present lecture. It is enough to say here, that no one who thinks to restore the text of Phaedrus, often very much corrupted, can dispense with Hervieux' elaborate and unique volume, which forms the second part of his work *Phèdre et ses anciens imitateurs*.

The fact, if it is one, that the name of our fabulist was as unknown as were his verses from the time of Avianus to the fifteenth century, is the more remarkable because among the five MSS. which have been discovered of the fables, two, the *Pithoeanus* and *Remensis*, were written in the ninth or at latest tenth century, one, the *Codex of Daniel*, containing only a few fables, in the eleventh; the other two, the *Perottine* codex and its duplicate the *Vaticanus*, in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. It is quite as remarkable that though Perotti, Archbishop of Siponto, not only knew of the existence of Phaedrus, but transcribed many of his fables with his own hand in the middle of the fifteenth century, the first printed edition was not given to the world till the very end of the sixteenth, in September of the year 1596.

The editor¹ of this editio princeps of Phaedrus was a man of no little celebrity in the religious and literary history of that time. Pierre Pithou was born at Troyes, on Nov. 1, 1539. His father, himself a distinguished *avocat* in that city, chose the same profession for his son, and sent him to be trained by Cujas, the great jurist and friend of Scaliger, at Bourges and Valence. He began pleading at Paris in 1564, but retired in 1567 to Troyes, hoping to succeed better in a provincial town, where his want of words and

¹ See Hervieux, i. pp. 35 sqq.

readiness would stand less in his way. But he had been trained a Protestant, and the Catholic party, which was the stronger, would not allow him to appear at the bar. He retired to Basel in Switzerland, and remained there till 1570. Returning to Paris he published his edition of forty-two *Nouellae* of the Emperors Theodosius the younger, Valentinian, and Anthemius, and dedicated it to Cujas. Shortly after this he visited England in the suite of the Duc de Montmorenci, who had been sent on an extraordinary mission to Queen Elizabeth. After a brief stay of two months, he returned to France. He was in Paris during the St. Bartholomew massacre, and barely escaped assassination. Later he became a Catholic and lived on terms of intimacy with both parties. The high estimation in which he was held is shown by his being selected in 1581, to reply to the letter in which Pope Gregory XIII had complained of the Ordonnance of Blois, as contravening the decrees of the Council of Trent; and by his appointment as Procureur-Général to the temporary Court of Justice which Henri IV established in 1594. In this office his chief task was that of a pacificator; a congenial function which he seems to have discharged with success.

During the legal vacation of 1595 (I am here translating from Grosley's biography), which following his usual custom Pithou spent at Troyes, his brother, François, had given him a unique copy of the *Fables* of Phaedrus, which up to that time had escaped the researches of antiquarians; the very existence of the work was hardly suspected. Pithou had already transcribed them and given them to his publisher Patisson, when the plague broke out in Paris and obliged him to retire with his family to Troyes. He withdrew the work from Patisson and published it at Troyes.

It is a little volume in duodecimo, containing seventy pages. The title-page has these words *Phaedri Aug. liberti Fabularum Aesopiarum libri V, nunc primum in lucem editi. Augustobonae Tricassium excudebat Io. Odotius, typographus regius Anno CID. ID. XCVI. cum privilegio.*

In a short prefatory letter, addressed to his brother François, Pithou says: 'to you Phaedrus owes his existence, since, when he had almost been buried by the injury of time, thanks to the copy discovered by you, I have endeavoured to bring him back to life.'

The book is now rare: Hervieux knew of only eleven copies, one of which is in the Bodleian. I have found it of great utility for restoring the text of the fables by the closeness with which it reproduces the MS.

Pithou only survived the publication of his Phaedrus by two months. It is disappointing that we do not know certainly where François found the MS. The only indication of its provenance is supplied by a note at the end of Pithou's edition 'uet. ex. Cat.' Orelli supposed, not improbably, that this means 'uetus exemplar Catalaunense (Châlons-sur-Marne) or Catuacense (Douai). The hypothesis of Adry that it came from the Abbey of S. Benoit-sur-Loire has been shown by Hervieux to be wrong.

The MS. shortly after Pithou's death was re-collated by Rigault for his edition of 1599¹, and by Bongars², Henri IV's minister plenipotentiary in Germany and intimately connected with Pierre and François Pithou. Bongars' collation is now in the library of Bern. That he made it very carefully and was fully aware of the MS.'s unique importance is shown by his note at the end of the last Fable 'Seq. in v. c. libellus de uariis monstris ac portentis ex fabulis Graecorum et al.'³.

The MS. passed eventually into the family of Le Pelletier. In 1780, M. Le Pelletier de Rosambo seems to have allowed Brotier to examine it. During the French Revolution it lay *perdu*, and for some time was not known to be in existence. It was however still in the possession of the Le Pelletiers, and in 1830, its then owner, the Vicomte de Rosambo, allowed M. Berger de Xivrey to re-edit it,

¹ Second edition 1617, 3rd 1630.

² Jacques de Bongars, born at Orleans 1546, died at Strasburg 1612.

³ Hervieux, i. p. 47.

with a full description, facsimiles, and a new and very careful collation. The work of M. Berger de Xivrey, an octavo of 268 pages, was limited to 200 copies and is very difficult to procure. I have not been able to find it in the Bodleian or in the British Museum. In these exacting days of palaeographical minutiae, it is more than probable that many scholars will ask to have the MS., or at least some portion of it, photographed. I believe that this natural wish is likely to be, at least in part, gratified. It would be a real boon to philologists should M. Chatelain include it in his invaluable facsimiles of ancient Latin MSS. Nearly 300 years have elapsed since Pithou first edited the MS. ; but it still remains unique, the single perfectly trustworthy exemplar in which the iambics of Phaedrus have come down to us.

There was however up to the year 1774 in existence a second MS. of much the same age and equal goodness, the *Remensis*. It was so called from the Abbey of S. Remi at Rheims, where it was discovered in 1608 by the learned Jesuit Sirmond, then returned from Rome and making a tour of research in Champagne and Lorraine. The readings of this codex were first used by Rigault, an *élève* of the Jesuits, in the second edition of his Phaedrus published in 1617. It was also used by Gude¹. It is believed, though the fact is not absolutely certain, to have been burnt in 1774, when the Abbey of S. Remi was destroyed by fire. Fortunately for us, Dom Vincent, the librarian of the Abbey, had made a facsimile of one page of the MS. for a M. de Fonce-magne in 1769, and had also entered its variants for most of the Fables in the margin of an edition of 1743, published by Widow Brocas at Paris. This book containing Dom Vincent's variants was sent by him to the Royal Library of Paris, and there seen and used by Brotier and Adry ; later by Berger de Xivrey, who included in his volume of 1830, with the collation of the

¹ Gude does not seem to have himself *seen* the *Remensis*, for he says of Rigault 'idemque accidit Rigaltio qui MS. Remense uiderat.'

Pithocanus, a careful transcript of the variants of the *Remensis* noted by Dom Vincent. The volume itself disappeared not long after it had been examined by de Xivrey, and neither Hervieux nor Lucian Müller have been able to retrace it¹.

However, the facsimile executed by Dom Vincent on tracing-paper in 1769, once in possession of Lord Stuart de Rothesay and subsequently bought by M. Hervieux², enables us to pronounce with some certainty that the *Remensis* was written in the tenth century. It agrees very closely with the *Pithocanus*, not only in having the same lacunae and as a rule identical readings, but also in the fact that the verses of Phaedrus are written continuously as prose. The handwriting however is completely different; a detail which I mention, because there have not been wanting critics who asserted that the two MSS. were identical. Another difference between the two MSS. was that whereas in the *Pithocanus* the Fables were followed by a treatise *de monstribus*, in the *Remensis* they were followed by the late Latin Comedy known as *Querolus* or *Aulularia*.

A third MS. known now as *codex Danielis*, earlier as *vetus Danielis chartula*, or *codex Petavii*, or *schedae regiae*³, or *Vossianus*, is more interesting from its vicissitudes than for its intrinsic value. It seems to have been originally in the Abbey of S. Benoit Fleury at Orleans. When the Abbey was pillaged by the Huguenots in 1562, Pierre Daniel, the well-known philologist⁴, a native of Orleans,

¹ Another collation of the *Remensis*, made by the Jesuit Denys Roche of Rheims for Père Vavassour of Paris in the seventeenth century, has been published by Chatelain in *Revue de Philologie* for 1887, pp. 80, sqq.

² Hervieux has published this facsimile, as well as facsimiles of the four other MSS., vol. ii. pp. 75-83.

³ I. e. in the library of Queen Christina of Sweden. See Elton's notice of this collection in *Bibliographica*, i. (1894).

⁴ Daniel edited the *Querolus* at Orleans in 1564. It is strange that so learned a man should have taken no step in publishing the eight fables of Phaedrus which his MS. contained. Hervieux suggests that he did not think it worth his while to print a mere fragment. Against this it may be urged that the eight fables are not only written in their proper verse form, but headed in large and distinct

where his distinction as an advocate had raised him to the dignity of *bailli* of the Abbey, had the adroitness to recover or buy back most of the MSS. in the library, amongst them the codex in question. At his death in 1603 it was bought by another erudite Orléanois, Paul Petau, an antiquarian and collector of rare medals, books, and MSS. At the sale of his son Alexander Petau's library in 1650 or 1651, it was obtained by Isaac Voss, at this time librarian and instructor in Greek to Christina of Sweden, for the royal library. When Christina abjured Lutheranism and became a Catholic her library followed her to Rome, and after her death in 1689 was secured for the Vatican. Here the codex remained till 1797, when, after the occupation of Rome by Napoleon and the army of the French Republic, it was sent to Paris as one of 500 MSS. which the Papal government ceded to France. When Cardinal Mai published in 1831 vol. iii. of his *Classici auctores e Vaticanis codicibus editi*, it had returned to the Vatican, where it was re-collated by Hervieux in 1869.

It is a composite MS. containing several distinct works. The fragment of Phaedrus, eight fables in all, fills three pages, the recto and verso of fol. 17, and the recto of fol. 18. The fables are all from Book i., 11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21¹ in the ordinary numeration.

The writing, of which Hervieux gives a facsimile (ii. p. 77), is assigned by him to the eleventh century. This MS. was used by Rigault; but does not appear to have been seen by the other early editors of Phaedrus. Gude often quotes its readings, probably as reported by Rigault and Salmasius.

It remains to speak of the two fifteenth century MSS.,

capitals PHEDI. AV̄G. LIBER. ꝑ. AESOP | 2IARV̄. INCIP̄FELICITER. From this it would seem that they were called *Aesopiae*: the 2 (r) after AESOP is an error of the scribe.

¹ They are headed *De Leone et Asino*, *Cervus ad fontem laudat cornua*, *Vulpis ad Corvum*, *Canis ad Ovem*, *Lupus testis commodasse contendit*, *Mulier parturiens ad virum*, *Canis parturiens ad alteram*, 20 without heading, 21 *Leo deficiens*, *Aper*, *Taurus*, *Asellus* (Hervieux, i. p. 93).

one at Naples, the other in the Vatican. They are identical in contents, but the latter was written after the former.

The earlier of the two is sometimes called *Perottinus*, from Niccolo Perotti, born in 1430, called to Rome 1456, and there appointed Apostolic Secretary, made Archbishop of Siponto or, as the see was re-named after the destruction of Siponto, Manfredonia, in 1458, afterwards successively governor of Umbria and Perusia. He died in 1480. He was the author of many works; the best known is perhaps his *Cornu Copiae*: not the least interesting is his commentary on the *Silvae* of the poet Statius, a work which was re-discovered by Poggio in Switzerland only a few years before Perotti was born.

Early in life, as he tells us in his *Cornu Copiae*, and in the letter addressed to his compatriot Titus Mannus Veltrius, which forms the first section of the *codex Perottinus* I am now describing, Perotti employed his leisure moments in copying into a note-book, with no regular order or sequence, 32 of the fables of Phaedrus, 36 of Avianus, 31 of a third iambic fabulist of whom we know nothing except that his style is very like Phaedrus. With these fables which he must have taken from a MS. or MSS. now lost, Perotti intermingled compositions of his own, sometimes epigrams, sometimes letters to his friends. The whole collection he dedicated to his nephew Pyrrho Perotti in the following words:—*Nicolai Perotti Epitome fabellarum Aesopi Aviani et Phedri ad Pyrrhum Perottum fratris filium adolescentem suauissimum incipit foeliciter.*

This MS. remained unknown and unnoticed till 1727 when Jaques Philippe d'Orville, then travelling in Italy, saw it at Parma and made a copy of it which he sent to Burmann who was preparing a new edition of his Phaedrus. Burmann only availed himself of the variants in the 32 fables of Phaedrus which the MS. contained: these variants he mentions in his preface. About ten years later¹

¹ Hervieux, i. p. 120.

the MS. was transferred with the rest of the Farnese library to Naples. At Naples it was re-discovered by the Abbé Andrès, and the 31 new fables, now generally known as Perottine or *Appendix Perottina*, were published for the first time in 1808 by Cassitto, and shortly afterwards in 1811 by Jannelli, whom Cassitto seems to have forestalled. The result was an acrimonious controversy which may be read in Hervieux, i. pp. 111 sqq.

The real victory rests with Jannelli, a scholar of the best type, whether as a decipherer of obscure and often obliterated writing, or as a restorer of the erased original by happy and judicious conjecture. I am making no random assertion: Jannelli's emendations of the Perottine fables were confirmed twenty years later, by the discovery of the duplicate codex in the Vatican.

This second codex was edited by Cardinal Mai in 1831. It minutely reproduces the codex of Perotti, but with this difference, that instead of the obliterations and unreadable words which disfigure Perotti's MS., it is written in a perfectly clear handwriting of the early sixteenth century.

Lucian Müller, who has examined the variants of these two late MSS. with some minuteness, considers that they are of very little value for restoring the text of Phaedrus, and that the earlier codices, the *Pithoeanus* and *Remensis*, are so far superior in antiquity, and therefore in orthography and freedom from interpolation, as to be nearly always paramount where there is any question of readings. There are however a few places in the fables, where the two fifteenth-century MSS. seem to have preserved the right tradition against *P* and *R*. The most noteworthy of these is ii. Epil. 1, where *P* gives

Aesopo ingentem (*m. pr.* Aesopi ingento) statuam posuere Attici

R had

Aesopi ingentem s. p. Attici

N and *V* agree in giving

Aesopi ingenio s. p. Attici.

This *ingenio* was conjecturally restored by Gude, and is clearly right.

iii. 7, 2-4, are thus given in *PR*:

Cani perpasto macie confectus lupus
Forte occurrit dein salutantes inuicem
Ut restiterunt.

The Perottine and Vatican MSS. give—

Forte occurrunt; dein salutati inuicem.

where *occurrunt* is obvious, and had been restored by Bentley; *salutati* seems to me as certainly right, conveying as it does a quasi-middle use of the passive participle, which has other analogies.

Ib. 15, 16:—

dum procedunt, aspicit
Lupus a catena collum detritum canis.

So *PR*: the Perottine and Vatican MSS. have *cani*, which is better.

The publication of the thirty-one new fables in Perotti's codex raised a controversy which is not yet settled. Are they by Phaedrus, or by some imitator? It is a necessary preliminary to any discussion of this point, to attempt a characterization of the undoubtedly genuine fables. These may be considered under two heads:—

- (1) As to their exhibition of the writer's idiosyncrasies.
- (2) As to their literary merit.

(1) The genuine fables present Phaedrus to us, notably, as (a) indifferent to money, (b) supremely conscious of his greatness as a writer.

(a) He says of himself in the Prologue to Book iii. that he had utterly banished from his heart the care of gain:

Curamque habendi penitus corde eraserim;

and in v. 4, 7, 8 moralizing on the fable of the ass refusing the barley on which pigs were fed, because he observed that they had their throats cut after eating it, he says—

Huius respectu fabulae deterritus
Periculosum semper uitaei lucrum;

and the undesirableness of great wealth is the lesson which he himself draws from his apologue of Hercules turning his back on Plutus in heaven (iv. 12).

(b) Phaedrus, if indifferent to money,—one of the greatest of virtues at a time when rich *liberti* were becoming the most powerful class in Rome,—was supremely self-satisfied as an author. In the Epilogue of Book ii. he compares himself with Aesop, to whose genius the Athenians erected a statue, openly professes himself his rival, and declares that his fables will swell the list of writers comparable with the great writers of Greece. In the Epilogue to Book iii. he takes a higher tone. ‘If you wish to read me, you must allow yourself some leisure. The Muses’ threshold is not open to all. Even I, born in their native home, Pieria, bred from my infancy in the lecture-room, indifferent to money, find only jealous admission to the circle.’ He goes on to explain the origin of fables, and his own purpose in writing them: not to reflect on individuals, but to portray the actual life and manners of mankind. ‘If Aesop the Phrygian, Anacharsis the Scythian, could immortalize themselves by writing fables, why should not I, born in Thrace, and a compatriot of Linus and Orpheus, who charmed the beasts and the forests with his song?’

In Book iv. his self-satisfaction has obviously increased. ‘If jealousy seeks to disparage my new volume, it may go on disparaging, provided it cannot imitate.’ Again, in the twenty-second fable, ‘I well know that envy will ascribe all that is good in me to Aesop, and declare anything poor to be mine. I have one answer to make: Aesop invented, Phaedrus perfected.’

And in the Epilogue, he rises to the self-satisfaction of Horace, Vergil, Ovid, and Statius, prophesying his own immortality and assuring Particulo that their two names would be associated for ever.

(2) This self-satisfaction was however founded on real literary merit. Whether in language or in the general

style of his fables, Phaedrus may be ranked among the best writers of Rome; the Latin of the fables is the pure undebased Latin of the best period of the golden, not the silver age. It is doubtful whether the few exceptions which occur, such as v. 1, 15, 16¹

Quisnam cinaedus ille in conspectu meo
Audet uenire?

for *in conspectum meum* is not an error of our MSS.

In i. 8. 7:—

Tandem persuasa est iureiurando gruis

for *tandem persuasum est iureiurando grui*;

iii. 5, 8:—

Persuasus ille fecit

the unusual construction of *persuadeor* may be defended from the use of the treatise *ad Herennium*, i. 6, 9; and Ovid, *A. A.* iii. 679; as well as from the analogy of *inuideor*. Bentley denies the Latinity of *Quis* for *uter* in i. 24, 8 (*Quis maior esset*). Of the Greek words which appear in the fables some were already naturalized in Roman speech, e.g. *cinaedus*, *malus*, *triclinium*, or familiar through the comic poets, as *toxicum*, *musicus*, *strophæ*: others were new and became classical partly owing to their employment by Phaedrus, e.g. *xystus*, *basis*, *antidotum*, *pegma*, and perhaps *sophus*. The curious word *ardelio*, or as my lamented predecessor, Prof. Nettleship, inclines to write it, *ardalio*², ‘a busy-body,’ which Phaedrus defines as *Gratis anhelans, multa agendo nihil agens*, is remembered less perhaps from Phaedrus, than from Martial’s *magnus es ardelio*.

The style of the Fables is admitted to be excellent³.

¹ L. Müller, *De Phaedri et Aviani Fabulis*, p. 4.

² *Contributions to Latin Lexicography*, p. 267. Nettleship states that three spellings are found in glossaries, *ardalio*, *ardelio*, *ardulio*.

³ Hare, in his damaging attack on Bentley’s emendations of Phaedrus, says (*Epist. Crit.* p. 7): *Semper Phaedrum inter optimos latinitatis auctores aut optimis proximum habui*. The *Epistola Critica* is now a rare book; but no lover of Phaedrus should omit to read it.

The story is told naturally and without effort or parade of words, contrasting very favourably with Avianus, whose aim is to show off his command of Vergilian diction and the grand style. While Avianus is diffuse and artificial, Phaedrus is succinct and simple; in Avianus the rudeness of Latin in its decadence is palpable through all his trappings; in Phaedrus the narrative is uniform, equable, and with a certain charm which lingers in the memory. At times he is undeniably witty. Take the fable of the Lion taking the four shares (i. 5)—

Vacea et capella et patiens ouis iniuriæ
Socii fuere cum leone in saltibus.
Illi cum cepissent ceruum uasti corporis,
Sic est locutus partibus factis leo :
Ego primam tollo, nominor quoniam leo ;
Secundam, quia sum fortis, tribuetis mihi ;
Tum, quia plus ualeo, me sequetur tertia ;
Malo adficietur, si quis quartam tetigerit.

Most vivid is the description of a donkey bursting into a sudden bray—

Hic auritulus
Clamorem subito totis tollit uiribus
Nouoque turbat bestias miraculo :

pathetic the sick lion's noble rage at the ass's kick (i. 21)—

At ille exspirans : fortis indigne tuli
Mibi insultare : te, naturæ dedecus,
Quod ferre cogor, certe bis uideor mori :

comic the reflexion of the fox when he could not reach the grapes (iv. 3, 4)—

Nondum matura est : nolo acerbam sumere :

concise the fable of the fox and the mask (i. 7)—

Personam tragicam forte uulpis uiderat.
O quanta species, inquit, cerebrum non habet !

sarcastic the reply of Tiberius to the officious *atriensis*, who kept watering the garden path at Misenum to lay the dust before him—

Multo maioris alapæ mecum ueneunt.

No small part of Phaedrus' success lies in his dextrous management of the iambic senarius. He is very judicious in combining lines where, in accordance with the older licence of Roman comedy, spondees, dactyls, and anapaests are freely introduced, with lines of the stricter type familiar to us from Greek Tragedy and the Epodes of Horace¹, in which the iambus is the predominant, and the spondee the only other frequent rhythm. In his best fables, especially in Book i., he is careful to make the second foot an iambus more often than not; a remark which does not apply equally to the fourth or *a fortiori* the fifth foot. Indeed one of his strictest rules, just as it has been thought to be with Plautus and Terence, is to *exclude* iambs from the fifth foot if the last word in the line is a cretic. Such a verse as—

Canis parturiens cum rogasset alteram

is of very rare occurrence. On the other hand the anapaest in the fifth, so normal in Seneca's tragedies, is frequent also in Phaedrus. It is usual with him, especially in his longer flights, when the verse has run on for some time with the freedom of the laxer iambic, to arrest the attention suddenly by one artfully constructed, sometimes highly elaborated, line. Such are—

Ex alticinctis unus atriensibus (ii. 6, 11)

in the story of Tiberius and the Atriensis, or

Silentium ipsa fecit expectatio (v. 5, 15)

in the story of the Mimic and the Country Clown. Such occasional felicities give a sparkle to the narrative and make us recur to the fables with pleasure.

Lessing, as is well known, criticized Phaedrus' accuracy on a matter of fact. In one of the fables (i. 4) a dog, while swimming, sights his own reflexion in the water, and thinking he sees another dog carrying another piece of flesh, drops the piece he holds in his own mouth.

¹ The *pure* iambic does not exist in Phaedrus.

But water, to give a reflexion, must be undisturbed; the motion produced by swimming would not permit the dog to see his own image. This is true; but the fable is older than Phaedrus, and the inaccuracy is perhaps attributable to the first inventor¹.

I have myself noticed in the fable of the Eagle, the Cat, and the Boar a similar misrepresentation. The eagle and boar, each with its family of young, die of hunger through the machinations of the cat, and the cat thereupon uses them as food for itself and its own young. That the animal described is identical with our own cat is proved by the allusion to its nocturnal prowlings—

Inde euagata noctu suspensio pede;

but no cat, I imagine, would nowadays be supposed to feed on young pigs, particularly if, instead of being killed, they had died a natural death. Possibly the habits of the undomesticated animal 1900 years ago did not correspond in every point with those of the creature as known to ourselves.

If indeed we might trust Hartman², the Fables abound with similar mistakes: Phaedrus' only care, he says, was to versify his story in good senarii: if he effected this, he did not scruple to corrupt the original apologue of Aesop by unnecessary or unsuitable changes. To which I would reply that Aesop is a mere name³, and that in most cases we do not know with certainty what the original form of any fable was. After a conscientious study of our Roman fabulist I have arrived at an opinion the very reverse of Hartman's: I suspect that if we knew the earliest shape which any given fable took, we should find

¹ See Appendix.

² *De Phaedri fabulis commentatio*, Lugduni Batavorum, 1890. An interesting dissertation by a pupil of Cobet's, whose manner of instructing his students is humorously sketched, pp. 90, 91. Hartman has some good remarks about Hare's criticism of Bentley, pp. 92 sqq. Bentley's emendations of Phaedrus were published separately, with the *Sententiae* of P. Syrus, by Pinzger in 1833, at Breslau.

³ See however Rutherford, *Babrius*, Introd. p. xxxv.

that it came from the hands of Phaedrus improved and dignified.

It remains to say a few words about the thirty-one new fables published at the beginning of the century. Jannelli in the second of his three dissertations tried to prove that they must be by Phaedrus; almost at the same time Adry repudiated them. Jannelli's opinion has found most support: Cardinal Mai, Orelli, Lachmann, L. Müller, Hervieux, Ribbeck, all believe them to be the genuine work of Phaedrus. On the other hand Heyne of Göttingen, the editor of Vergil and Homer, basing his opinion however on the imperfect edition of Cassitto, pronounced them to be a work of antiquity, assignable to some rival of Phaedrus, but greatly inferior to Phaedrus in genius and purity of diction. This is also the opinion of Riese¹.

At the risk of dissenting from so many scholars of eminence, I am inclined to side with the minority. Looking at the thirty-one Perottine fables as a whole, their general resemblance to the genuine collection in style, language, and metre is undeniable. More than a third of the Perottine collection does not fall below the average goodness of Phaedrus: some few are in his very best manner, e.g. ix *De mulierum libidine* or the apologue of the hen's scratching. xix *Equus quadrigalis in pistrinum uenumdatus* or the horse in reduced circumstances. xxv *Seruus et dominus* or the good-for-nothing slave reproved. xxix *Papilio et Vespa* or Past and Present. The story of the Ephesian widow xiii, which is also in Petronius, is told well, and the introduction of an artistic alliterative line like *Cotidiana capta consuetudine* is in an especial manner Phaedrian. Even more distinctly in his style is the recurrence of one of his most often observed characteristics, the use of abstracts² for concretes in such combinations as *tua calamitas* for *tu calamitosus*, or *corui deceptus stupor* for *deceptus stultus coruus*, or *colli longitudinem* for *collum*

¹ *Anthol. Lat.* ii. Praef. p. xxxi.

² L. Müller, *De Phaedri et Aviani Fabulis*, p. 5; Hervieux, i. p. 176.

praelongum, which last has its exact counterpart in the third of the Perottine fables :—

Emungere igitur se uolens prendit manu
Traxitque ad terram nasi longitudinem.

But these points of similarity in no way prove identity : an imitator reproduces the saliences of his model ; and if Phaedrus had called the crane's long neck *colli longitudinem*, that is the very reason why he would *not* borrow from himself¹, and talk of *nasi longitudinem*. Again, though, as I said, a section of the Perottine fables is up to the level of Phaedrus², it is equally true, that a larger section is not. Many of them are weak ; many end in a way which is unlike Phaedrus, e.g. xviii *Aesopus et seruus profugus* ; xxiii *Serpens et Lacerta* ; xxvi *Lepus et Bubulcus* ; xxx *Terraneola et Vulpes* ; some contain allusions which we should not expect from him. One of the most notable of these is in the fable of the Beaver (xxviii). The writer, observing that the Greeks called this animal *Castor*, takes occasion to scoff at their poverty of language, which could find nothing better to call it by than the name of a God :—

Canes effugere cum iam non potis est fiber,
Græci loquaces quem uocarunt Castorem
Et indiderunt bestiae nomen dei,
Illi, qui iactant se uerborum copia.

In a word, these Perottine fables leave on the mind a total impression very like the various imitations of Ovid, the *Nux*, or the *Epiccdion Drusi*, or the spurious *Heroides*. They are often so similar as to seem to come from the same hand ; yet the difference is perceptible, and the whole effect not quite the same.

External grounds point to the same conclusion. Perotti ascribes his fables to three sources, Aesop, Avianus, and

¹ L. Müller, *De Phaedri et Aviani Fabulis*, p. 12, collects a number of such parallelisms of expression.

² One of the stories in the Perottine Appendix (the Ass and the two Suitors) is in the Decameron (Ribbeck, *Geschichte der Römischen Dichtung*, iii. p. 31).

Phaedrus. Our MSS. of Avianus and Phaedrus correspond with his: what was his Aesop? probably a collection in Latin iambics of fables which were not included in Phaedrus, and were ascribed to Aesop, because their real author was unknown, or because the name of Aesop is the figure-head in Romulus and the other prose versions. From this non-Phaedrian or Aesopian collection in Latin iambics was derived that part of Romulus, and the prose-paraphrases of the Middle Age, which deals with the same stories or fables as are extant in the Perottine collection. For just as the actual fables of Phaedrus (those contained in the *Pithoeanus* and *Remensis*), after their reduction to prose in Romulus and the other paraphrases, preserve the traces of their original iambic form; so the Perottine fables, where they have undergone a similar transfusion in the prose of Romulus and the rest of the paraphrasts, betray the manifest presence of the same iambic metre: this is particularly clear in the prose versions of the xxviith, *Meretrix et Iuuenis*, which a skilful writer of Latin verses might almost restore to its original iambic shape.

It may be said, 'But these prose versions, wherever they point to iambic metre, were probably drawn either from a more complete Phaedrus than we possess, or from a MS. which had preserved (perhaps by themselves) such of the genuine fables as had been rejected from the abridged Phaedrus of *P. R.*'

To this I would reply: 'Your hypothesis is gratuitous, and not that to which facts most naturally point. If Phaedrus was abridged, the abridged work would be likely to supersede the original; but if the completer original still lingered on, it would survive as an unabridged whole. But that it did not so survive, is proved by Perotti's ascribing part of his collection to Aesop; which he would not have done, if anything had indicated that they belonged to Phaedrus.'

As Perotti in definite terms ascribes his collection to Phaedrus, Avianus, Aesop, as we have no proof of a completer

Phaedrus existing then, than that we now possess, it seems most natural to believe that when he speaks of Aesop, he does not mean Phaedrus, but a perfectly distinct source, which in his MS. was, for want of better knowledge, labelled with the name of the old Greek fabulist.

APPENDIX

LESSING.

SEE his *Abhandlungen über die Fabeln*, vol. v. pp. 415-418, ed. Lachm. Lessing criticizes four fables of Phaedrus from this point of view. Of the first (i. 4, The dog and his shadow) Coraes gives no less than six Greek versions. In the first two, the dog ποταμὸν διέβαινε: in the third, fourth, and sixth, as he passes along a river sees his reflexion and drops the meat; in the fifth, comes to a river, and while crossing it (περαιούμενος), sees the reflexion of the meat *magnified* in the water: it is not certain therefore (as nothing is said anywhere of a *bridge*) that the Greek versions are free from the same error as Phaedrus. (2) The fable of the cow, she-goat, and sheep going shares with the lion. Lessing criticizes such a partnership as absurd, and says it is not found in the original Greek form, where an onager or wild ass shares with a lion the prey they capture in the chase. Moreover, the reasons assigned by Phaedrus are weak: the original has τὴν μὲν μίαν εἶπε λήψομαι ὡς πρῶτος· βασιλεὺς γὰρ εἰμι. τὴν δὲ δευτέραν, ὡς ἐξ ἴσου κοινῶν. Ἡ δὲ τρίτη μοῖρα· αὕτη κακὸν μέγα σοι ποιήσει, εἰ μὴ ἐθέλεις φυγεῖν. But here again Coraes gives another iambic version in which the partners with the lion are a crane and a fox, and the three reasons assigned by the lion for retaining all the shares make no mention of κοινωνία. (3) The fable of the ass helping the lion to hunt (Phaedr. i. 11). Phaedrus makes the ass, covered with bushes, frighten the animals by a loud sudden bray, upon which they fly in all directions, and attempting to escape by different exits are seized by the lion. In the Greek fable, the ass enters a cavern in which she-goats are collected, frightens them out by braying, and they are then seized by the lion. [The Greek fabulist is careful to state that *most* of them are seized; *some* therefore escaped. There is no such reservation in Phaedrus!] (4) The two wallets (iv. 10). Phaedrus represents the wallets as hung on mankind by *Jupiter*, thus imputing the perverse judgments man forms to divine agency. In the Greek versions, the god is left out. But Phaedrus of course means no more than that *nature* or *destiny* assigned to mankind two different standards in judging themselves and their neighbours. On the whole, these criticisms of Lessing can hardly be thought to go for much. He has other remarks on Phaedrus, vol. ii. pp. 103-110.

CHRISTOPHER WASE'S EMENDATIONS OF PHAEDRUS.

Wase published a duodecimo edition of Phaedrus in 1668. There are three pages of emendations. The book is rare; and I shall be doing Wase no more than justice by recording the most notable of them.

i. 26, 4, Prior inuitasse et illi liquidam in patina *PR*.

Wase thought *breui* had fallen out at the end. He would read *Prior inuitasse et ei liquidam in p. breui*. The prose paraphrase published by Nilant (vol. ii. p. 144, Hervieux) has *et posuit illi in scutella sorbitiunculam*. The *illi* of *PR* might be retained by writing *liquidam illi in p. breui*.

i. 30, 7, Est ratio separata inquit ac diuersum genus *PR*.

Wase, *Ratio esto separ, ait*, ac d. g. In this he agrees with Scioppius in considering *separata* to have taken the place of *separ*: but Scioppius, with more verisimilitude, would write *Est ratio separ ait ac d. g.* Possibly we should omit *ac*, retaining *separ*. *Est ratio separ, inquit, diuersum genus*.

ii. Prolog. 12, Ita sic rependet illi breuitas gratiam *PR*.

Wase, *Ita si* rependet illi b. g. So also Heinsius; but Wase seems to have the priority in publication. *Si* is obviously right, and is accepted as such by Bentley. The rest of Wase's emendation is wrong.

iv. 23, 7, Venire in patriam uoluit cursu pelagi *PR*.

pelagio Wase: but the same correction had been made by Bongars.

v. 5, 2, Et pro iudicio dum stant erroris sui *PR*.

praeiudicio Wase, which he explains to mean ἐμμένειν προκρίματι. This seems to have been overlooked till it was revived, perhaps independently, by Bährens: it is accepted as from Bährens by L. Müller and Stowasser.

NOTE ON CHRISTOPHER WASE.

[The following particulars of Wase are communicated by my friend, Mr. H. E. D. Blakiston, Fellow of Trinity College.]

Christopher Wase, born 1625, scholar of Eton, and fellow of King's College, Cambridge. He wrote several translations, the first of which, a version of the Electra of Sophocles, dedicated to Charles I.'s daughter Elizabeth, with a Royalist 'Parallel' as the Epilogue, led to his being deprived of his fellowship and imprisoned. In 1654 he published a version of the Cynegetica of Gratius Faliscus, with complimentary verses by Waller prefixed. From 1662 to 1680 he was head master of Tonbridge School, where he produced several translations, a Latin Dictionary, and a tract on Free Schools; and at a later date he wrote on Metres. He was for some time Archetypographer and Esquire Bedel of Civil Law at Oxford, having been elected by the Masters in opposition to a candidate of Dean Fell: and died August 29, 1690.

ON SOME DOUBTFUL PASSAGES OF PHAEDRUS.

i. 11, 13, Qualis uidetur opera tibi uocis meae?

So cod. Danielis; but *P* gives

Quales (*m. pr. altered to Qualis*) tibi uidetur opera uocis meae:

R: Qualis opera tibi uidetur uocis meae;

which variations of order point to a disturbance. The rhythm, though exactly reproduced in iv. 7, 21 *Quid ergo possum facere tibi, lector Cato?* is objectionable, especially in B. i. metrically the most finished.

Desbillons conj. Q. uidetur tibi opera haec uocis meae?

This would suit very well with the answer—

Insignis, inquit, sic ut, nisi nossem tuum

Animum genusque, simili fugissem metu.

But it is equally possible that *tibi* was originally written over *uidetur* as an explanation, and subsequently taken into the verse, the actual word, probably a monosyllable, having fallen out.

A similar doubt attaches to v. 15, where *PR* both give *fuissem in metu*, Daniel's codex *fugissem metu*. The *in* would have a meaning, and may be right: 'I should have fled (*fugissem*) under pressure of (or, overpowered by) the same fright.'

i. 13, 8-10, Si uocem haberes, nulla prior ales foret.

At ille stultus dum uult uocem ostendere

Emisit ore caseum.

So *PR*, but Dan. has *At ille dum etiam uult uocem ostendere*, whence Bentley conj.

At ille dum etiam uocem uult ostendere,

Lallemant: At ille dum uult etiam uocem ostendere.

Dan.'s cod. adds *latiorem* before *emisit*, which of course may be only an expansion of *ostendere*; but it may also be a relic of the original, variously corrupted in *PR* and *Dan*. On this view, which is to some extent supported by the prose paraphrase published by Nilant, *ille dum uult uocem ostendere latiorem*, we might correct

At ille dum uult latiorem (*or clariorem*) ostendere

For the latter cf. the Bodleian paraphrase (Digb. 172) p. 337, Hervieux, *At ille dum placere uulpi uellet et uocem claram se habere iactanter demonstrare cuperet, aperto rostro clamare altius parans, sui oblitus casei, caseum perdidit.*

i. 15, 1, In principatu commutando ciuium

Nil praeter domini nomen mutant pauperes

PR add *saepius* after *ciuium*: and both Eyssenhardt and L. Müller retain this, expunging *ciuium*. My feeling, on grounds of metre, diction, and the proprieties of the story, is rather to keep *ciuium*. Metrically the sound is fuller and more pleasing: as *diction*, *principatus* would be less offensive if combined with a qualifying word like *ciuium*. Both Augustus and Tiberius

affected to be *ciuiles*, i.e. on a level with other Roman citizens: the combination *principatus ciuium* would fall in with this feeling. Again, the fable contains no allusion to more than *one* change of masters.

i. 16, 2, Non rem expedire, sed malum inferre expetit.

PR: *mala uidere expedit.*

The Valpy edition of 1822 records a conj. of one A. L. Z. which is worth mentioning: *male ridere*, to laugh in his sleeve. *Mala ridere* is also not impossible.

i. 25, 6 sqq. is thus written in *PR*

Sic Corcodrill(ill *R*)us: quamlibet lambe otio (otio^{us} *P*), pota accede noli timere sedulo ait ac (at *P*) noli uereri inquit, at ille facerem hercule; except that *P* originally had facerem^e hercule.

Rigault was the first to cure this corrupt passage by excising the whole of the words from *pota* to *ait ac*, beginning a new verse with *Noli uereri*, and omitting *inquit*. Bentley pronounced this to be right, and his authority has led Eyssenhardt and L. Müller to acquiesce in this very precarious amputation. With Orelli and Stowasser, I consider it almost certain that the words *pota accede noli timere sedulo ait ac* of both *P* and *R* are genuine remains of a verse once existent in *Phaedrus*, though now perhaps only partially recoverable. That *timere* is an error for *temere*, *sedulo* for *de dolo*, was a probable suggestion of Gude's. Adopting this as a basis, I would rearrange the words thus—

Accede, pota, noli temere de dolo,

Ait, uereri. At ille: facerem me hercules.

Nilant gives *quod libet labio tuo noli uereri*, a variant which is after all only a corruption. *Labeotio* would easily become *labeo tuo*: the spelling *labeum* is well attested.

ii. 3, 1, 2: Laceratus quidam morsu uehementis canis

Tinctum cruore panem inmisit malefico.

inmisit *PR*. The case is like i. 11, 15; it is not at all impossible that *in* is a mere dittograph of *m*, but it is not certainly so. If a loaf were scrambled amongst a number of dogs, *immittere* would be strictly correct: the word is retained though the dog is only one, not exactly = *mittere*, but with a suggestion of its more exact use. We might hear a single boy say 'scramble a copper' in the same loose way.

iii. 8, 6: illa irascitur

Nec glorientis sustinet fratris iocos

Accipiens quippe cuncta in contumeliam.

PR give *quid enim* for *quippe*, which Bentley substituted for it. But such a substitution is against *all* palaeographical rules, and Bentley himself on Hor. S. ii. 3¹, 132, suggests a far easier alternative, *quid ni*? But I do not believe any change is required. Hand, Tursellinus, s. v. (ii. p. 386) says *Quid enim*?

¹ *Incolumi capite es? quid enim? neque tu hoc facis Argis, Nec ferro, ut demens genitricem occidit Orestes*, which he alters to *quid ni*?

Latini dicunt, quum significare uolunt se recte sentire, uel uerum dicere, neque eum, quicum loquuntur, contra dicere quicquam posse,' and he goes on to quote Acron on Hor. S. i. 1, 7 *Militia est potior. Quid enim? concurritur horae Memento cita mors uenit aut uictoria laeta*, where Acron explains *Quid enim?* Quare non? et est comicum. The note of Porphyrius is in the same vein: 'Quasi interpellante effectum hoc dicitur, et est etiam consuetudinis nostrae.' The liveliness of such an interjected appeal was idiomatic, and should not be altered without more convincing arguments than Bentley alleges.

- iii. 10, 7, 8: Sed fabulosam ne uetustatem eleues
Narrabo tibi memoria quod factumst mea.

fabulosa *PR*, fabulosam *V* (the Vatican MS.); uetustatem *PRNV*, but in *R* Dom Vincent states that the *m* had been erased by another hand, and an *e* written over it (Hervieux, ii. p. 96); eleues, Guyet and after him Bentley; leuem *PR*; asseras *NV*. *Eleues* has been accepted by many editors, but is rejected by Hervieux, who prints *leuem*. Hervieux would have done better to restore the reading of both *P* and *R* *leuem*. Cic. Academ. Prior. ii. 22. 69 *Quamuis igitur fuerit acutus, ut fuit, tamen inconstantia leuatur auctoritas*. Hor. Epp. ii. 2, 10 *Multa fidem promissa leuant*. It is however true that *fabulosa* is in both *PR*: this would require *uetustate eleuem*: but none of the MSS. give *uetustate* except the corrector of *R*; hence I prefer to follow *V* and read *Sed fabulosam ne uetustatem leuem*. That the 1st person is meaningless, as Bentley states, is not true. If *leues* or *eleues* was written by Phaedrus, the *-em* of *uetustatem* may have caused the change to *leuem*. [Yet in iv. 26, 14 *Verum ut ne irate te dimissum censeas PR* give *sentiam*.]

- iii. Epilog. 13, 14: Si cito rem perages, usus fiet longior,
Fruar diutius si celerius cepero.

The quantity of *dīūtūs* here is not supported by *dīūtūs* in i. 2, 16. It seems to me impossible from so careful a metrist as Phaedrus. I suspect the right reading is *Fruar diu tum*. For *tum si*, cf. Catull. lxii. 37 *Quid tum si carpunt, tacita quem mente requirunt?*

- Ib. 16: Olim senio debilem
Frustra adiungere bonitas nitetur tua
Cum iam desierit esse beneficium utile.

So Pithou; but *PR* give

Cum iam desideret (*P*, -rat *R*) esse beneficium utilius.

Except that Dom Vincent states *beneficium* as the reading of *R*.

The word which, palaeographically, seems to me to determine the right restoration here is *utilius*. It is hard to see how this could be developed from *utile*. But if the archetype gave *utili*, the *us* might more easily have accreted to it, possibly from a confusion of the abbreviation of *-us* with some apex added to the *i*, just as *lacteolae* in Catull. lv. 17 has become in the Bolognese MS. *lacusteolae* probably from an original *lac'teolae*: cf. my remarks in vol. i. of my Catullus Proleg. p. v. I would write therefore

Cum iam desierit esse beneficium utili.

[*beneficio utilis*, Gude.]

- iii. Epilog. 26 : Decerne quod religio quod patitur fides
Et gratulari me fac iudicio tuo.

So Pithou. But for *me fac* *P* gives *me tacere* ; *R* had *me latere* or, according to Gude, *me tatare*. In this obscure word I believe lurks nothing more remote than *facere*, which might be a corruption of *face* = *fac* : or conceivably *face me*.

This last would be possible if *face me* was written over *me face*, thus : *me face*.
Either *me face* or *face me* is metrically admissible : but the latter has perhaps the advantage in sound. *iudicio* is dat., 'make me congratulate your judgment' on its well-timed interference in my behalf.

- iv. 2, 15 sqq. : Alter similiter periit, deinde et tertius.
Aliquot secutis uenit et retorridus
Qui saepe laqueos et muscipula effugerat.

Verse 16 is Rigault's correction of the MS. reading *Aliquot uenit saeculis reterritus* (re^{te}territus *P*). *Retorridus* is of course right : but I am less sure of the rest. If Vergil could make Euander say (Aen. viii. 508) *Sed mihi tarda gelu saeculisque effeta senectus*, Phaedrus might describe his old and wary mouse as *aliquot saeculis retorridus*, wizened by the lapse of several generations. The verse might begin with *Post* or *Mox*, then *uenit aliquot saeculis retorridus*.

- iv. 4, 3-5 : Sonipes iratus fero
Auxilium petiit hominis, quem dorso leuans
Rediit ad hostem. Iactis hunc telis eques
Postquam interfecit, sic locutus traditur.

P R give *lactus iactis*. Bentley seems right in saying that *lactus* can ill be spared. He would write *It in hostem lactus*. A less violent solution would be to omit *iactis*, as an explanatory gloss, written over *telis*, and then taken in as part of the verse.

[*lactus iaculis hunc eques*, Spengel.]

- iv. 5, 38 : Agros et uillam et pecora cum pastoribus
Donate moechae.

For *et uillam*, which is Bentley's conj., *P R* give *utiles*. I do not know whether any one has suggested *utilia* = *utensilia*. These would suit the 'gandens pecore et lanae dedita' to whom they would be alienated by the *moecha*, according to the ingenious calculation of Aesop.

- iv. 6, 1, 2 : Cum uicti mures mustelarum exercitu
Historia quorum et in tabernis pingitur

P R omit *et*. Possibly *uel tabernis*, or *in tot tabernis*.

- iv. 7, 1-4 : Tu qui, nasute, scripta destringis mea,
Parua labellum sustine patientia,
Seueritatem frontis dum placo tuac.

libellum *P R* ; labellum, Rigault, Bentley, and seemingly Bongars.

labellum may be criticized on two grounds, (1) the grotesque accumulation of *nose, lip, brow*, which it introduces ; (2) as not found in combination with *sustinere*. On the other hand the critical reader of Phaedrus' *libellus* (probably the single book, iv, in which the fable occurs) might well be asked to *bear with*

(*sustine*) it patiently. The other sense of 'not dropping' in disgust may be suggested, but is not the intended meaning of *sustine*¹.

iv. 19, 19: Odore canibus anum sed multo replent.

Sed multo, Bährens; but *sed multo* of *PR* is so idiomatic, that no one who has read Professor J. E. B. Mayor's note on Juv. v. 147, and his additions in the Index to vol. ii, s. v. *Sed*, can doubt that *PR* have here preserved Phaedrus' *uera manus*. Mayor translates 'aye, and what is more.'

Append. iii. 13: Id cum rideret forte meretrix ualidius.

NV gives Id cum forte meretrix (metrix *V*) ridet ualidius. The order which appears to me least objectionable is *Id meretrix forte cum rideret ualidius*.

Ib. vi. 13: Delicta uindicate; cohibete impios.

V gives *castigate*; possibly *adfectate* or *punit*.

Ib. xi. 3: Interrogauit an plus aduersarius
Valuisset.

V gives *ampliusne*. This might be *an plusne*. In Catull. xcvi. 2 I trace a similar rusticity of diction, and would write *Utrum os an culumne olfacerem Aemilio*, where MSS. give *an culum*.

Ib. 6-9: Quod, inquit, ergo stulte meruisti decus
Minus ualentem si uicisti fortior?
Ferendus esses, forte si te diceret
Superasse, melior qui fuisset uiribus.

V gives *qui esset melior uiribus*. The opposition of clauses seems to point to 'si te diceret minus fortem superasse qui melior esset uiribus.' *Minus* may have fallen out before *Superasse*, or *si te diceret* [minus] *Fortem superasse m. q. e. u.*

[Halbertsma conj. *arte* for *forte*: *furto* might also be suggested, with *Illum* before *superasse*.]

Ib. xiv. 6: Quos ultra paulo uilla ditis splendida

NV have *uilla splendidī diuitis*. Cassitto and Jannelli give *uilla splendida diuitis*, a form of anapaest in the fifth foot which must be pronounced improbable. But the adjective *splendidus* is too good in this connexion to be sacrificed. Cic. *Parad.* v. 38 *Reuinescat M. Curius aut eorum aliquis, quorum in uilla ac domo nihil splendidum, nihil ornatum fuit praeter ipsos*. Again, the gen. *splendidī* has every mark of genuineness. Should we write then *uilla ditis splendidī*? Hardly; because as nominative *ditis* is rarely, if ever, found: as genitive it must be adjective, not substantive. A Roman could say *splendidī diuitis*, a magnificent Croesus, but not *splendidī ditis*. It remains to write *uilla diues splendidī*.

Ib. 29: Aequalitatis inter plausus.

I doubt whether this use of *aequalitatis* = *aequalium* can safely be attributed to Phaedrus.

¹ Cf. Hare, *Epist. Crit.* p. 113.

App. xv.

The tone of this is very like the fifth poem of Herodas; Gastron is here represented by Acsop, Bitinna by Aesop's mistress.

Ib. 13: Omnes furore plena uocat et uerbera
Proponit grauia, nerum si non dixerint.

V *Furore plena uocat omnes ad uerbera.* Possibly

Furore plena uocat ad se omnes, uerbera P. grauia.

Ib. 15.

Spengel's conjecture (Philol. 33, p. 727) seems to me the best. *V* gives *Aliis minare inquit me non fallis certe*. Spengel conjectured, *Aliis minare: me inquit, non falles, era*: the last word had been suggested by Orelli. But a doubt still remains whether *certe* has not taken the place of *quidem*. L. Müller gives *me quidem haud falles, ait*. I do not like *haud*, especially as *V* gives *non*. But if the fabulist wrote *me equidem non falles, ait*, the combination might call for a gloss, and this gloss (*certe*) gradually oust the right word.

Ib. xvii. 1: *Premente partu scrofa cum gerneret iacens.*

V *N* both give *Tremente*, which is also in most of the prose paraphrases, e. g. Vienna cod. lat. 901 (Hervieux, ii. p. 294) and cod. lxxxvi in the library of Corpus Christi at Oxford (Herv. p. 372). The Berlin paraphrase, however, gives *Premente autem partum scroffa*, which must have been drawn from an archetype which had *Premente*. Cassitto and Jannelli had arrived at this by conjecture before the discovery of the Berlin MS.

Ib. 4: *Quae uero nosset pectoris fraudem improbi.*

V gives *pecoris*, which is more natural than *pectoris*. The wolf might be called *improbum pecus* as Ovid Ib. 457 calls a lion *pecus magnae parentis*. I see that Spengel also retains *pecoris*, writing after Fröhlich *pecoris cum fraudem i*. It would be less awkward to change *fraudem* to *fraudes*; for after *Quae*, here obviously causal, *cum* is more than superfluous.

NOTE ON A MISSING MS. OF PHAEDRUS.

Hearne, *Collectanea*, vol. ii. p. 281, Doble, 'Mr. Rawlinson of the Middle [Temple] has a MS. in which is contain'd Phaedrus's Fables, a Piece of Tully, &c.'

This is Thomas Rawlinson, who often lent his MSS. to Hearne. The MS. in question, if Hearne speaks correctly, contained with the Fables of Phaedrus some work or portion of a work of Cicero. No such MS. can be found in the Bodleian or British Museum, as Mr. Macray and Mr. F. G. Kenyon assure me.

The Bodleian possesses a Catalogue of T. Rawlinson's sale in 1733³/₄. Among these is a MS. (No. 314) containing with other tracts fables of Aesop and a liber synonymorum, perhaps the Ciceronian *synonyma*; but it is not known into whose possession this codex ultimately came, and Mr. Kenyon could not trace it in the MSS. of the British Museum.



AA 000 399 015 7



3 1158 00

